

A Coalition of Concerned Citizens
• 202 E 7th Street
Moscow ID 83843

December 27, 2003

Mr. Karl Dreher, Director
Idaho Department of Water Resources
PO Box 83720
Boise ID 83720-0098

RECEIVED

JAN - 6 2004

Department of Water Resources

Dear Mr. Dreher:

Enclosed is documentation supporting our petition regarding the Grande Ronde and Wanapum aquifers within the Palouse Basin, sent to you on November 21, 2003.

The overriding goal for the Coalition is sustainable use of our water resources for the overall benefit of current and future residents, without harm to the local ecology. Newspaper editorial comments on behalf of the local economic development community suggest that ethical, intergenerationally responsible management of our water supply should be negotiable, based on monetary wants. Presumably, the Idaho Department of Water Resources recognizes that such shortsighted concerns simply don't hold water.

The enclosed documentation is evidence that local government entities have not been working for the greater public good. We expect positive change within Moscow city government based on the outcome of the recent election, but anticipate continuing outside pressure will be needed to overcome the political inertia that has plagued adoption of real problem-solving measures for water resource planning.

Section summaries are presented together behind this cover letter with an identical copy at the beginning of each section for convenience. Section summaries include how each section pertains to the larger picture and a listing of the documents contained in that section in order of appearance.

Sections are held together with binder clips (rather than being bound) for your convenience in reading and to facilitate photocopying, should it be necessary. If additional documentation is needed, please contact Dianne French, PWCN, 202 E 7th St, Moscow ID 83843, 208-883-3937, pwcn@pwcn.org

The coalition appreciates your attention to this matter and desires a solution based on full public review of the problems associated with our regional groundwater supply as well as full public participation in the development of appropriate solutions.

Sincerely,



Bill French
202 E 7th Street
Moscow ID 83843-3002
Voice: 208-883-3937
Fax: 208-883-3211
Prairiedoc@moscow.com



Kelley Racicot
P.O. Box 9241
Moscow ID 83843
Voice: 509-334-6824
kelley@moscow.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: Petition

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. A copy of the petition itself
2. Time Line

Section 2: City of Moscow

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. Selected Excerpts from the 1999 Moscow Comprehensive Plan including growth estimates
2. Idaho Growth Projections
3. Latah County Growth Projections
4. Pumping Figures from the City of Moscow (1996 – 2003)
5. City of Moscow Water Department Memo from October 1999
6. Memo from Mark Cook to Gary Riedner with Moscow Annual Pumpage Table
7. Letter regarding discovery of multiple data sets by Bill French

Section 3: Proposed Action Not Taken

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. H&E Meeting Minutes, September 1993
2. Working Draft: PBAC to H&E—How a City Can Reduce Demand for Water, June 2000
3. H&E Water Conservation Plan, November 2000
4. "Proposed Water Conservation Timeline," Bill French, November 2000
5. "Presentation to Public Works/Finance Committee," February 2001
6. City of Moscow Public Works/Finance Committee Agenda packet, February 26, 2001
7. Water Resource Issues Past, Current, and Pending, Mark Cook to H&E, August 2001
8. Memo from Public Works Director Mark Cook to City Supervisor, June 11, 2003
9. H&E Draft Conservation Plan, June 2003

Section 4: Research

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. Geology and Hydrogeology of the Petition Area, Sarah Koerber
2. "Summary of Research Completed on the Moscow-Pullman Basin Hydrology", Bill Belknap, March 1999
3. Abstract: "Water Resource Implications...In a Basalt Aquifer," Larson, et. al., Nov-Dec 2000
4. "Water Efficiency on the Palouse" Helena Gregory, Spring 2000
5. "Water Usage In Moscow City Parks," Bill French, 1994-1999
6. Letter to City Council on Wasted Water at Fairgrounds, Bill French, September 2000
7. 2001 Report to Council on Comparison Water use for a conserving household and a non-conserving household, Bill French
8. Accounted-for Vs. Unaccounted-for Water

Section 5: Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. PBAC Web page—web site not updated since March 2002
2. PBAC Selected Minutes September 1999 through October 2003
3. PBAC Aquifer Storage and Recovery Information

Section 6: Rate Structure Proposals

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. "Moscow Water Issues," John Wenders, University of Idaho Economist, June 2001
2. "A Combination of Several Alternatives May Contribute to Reaching Goal," Juliet McKenna, PBAC Executive Secretary/Technical Advisor
3. Idaho Dept of Environmental Quality Water Fee Information from web site
4. Draft Proposal for Reducing Peak Water Usage in Moscow., Dianne (and Bill) French, March 2003

Section 7: Surveys

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. "The Conservation of Water in Moscow...Survey of Public Opinion," Dr. Gary Machlis, 1986
2. 2002 Moscow Citizen Survey, City of Moscow
3. Survey of Moscow Water Users, June 2003, City of Moscow

Section 8: Public testimony

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. "Water Supply on the Palouse," PBAC Executive Secretary/Technical Advisor Juliet McKenna, January 2001 Presentation to the Quarterly Leadership Breakfast (including City Councils and County Commissioners and Staff from Moscow, Pullman, Latah County and Whitman County)
2. Presentation to Public Works/Finance Committee of Moscow City Council by Dianne French, Moscow Commission on Health and the Environment, February 26, 2001
3. Selected Public Works/Finance Committee minutes
4. Dianne French Testimony to Moscow Planning and Zoning Commission regarding new annexation/development, November 12, 2003
5. Dianne French Testimony to Moscow City Council, December 15, 2003

Section 9: Correspondence

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

Numerous letters and emails in chronological order

Section 10: "Potable Quotables" and Newspaper Articles

Summary

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. "Potable Quotables"
2. Copies of various newspaper articles related to this issue over the years.

Appendix A:

1992 Groundwater Management Plan (GMP)
2000 PBAC Goals

Appendix B:

1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 PBAC Annual Reports and The Naylor Protocol

Appendix C:

Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) Information

Section 1: Petition

Summary:

A group of concerned citizens and citizen groups known together as the "water coalition" (coalition) approached the City of Moscow in the spring of 2003 with suggested measures the City could take to reduce water consumption for the 2003 watering season and work toward compliance with the 1992 Groundwater Management Plan. The Moscow City Council responded to coalition requests with hostility. Two members of the council responded, "this is a gun to our heads." Despite concrete measures the City could have taken to reduce pumpage as outlined by Mark Cook, director of Moscow's Public Works Department at that time, the council put "voluntary" watering restrictions in place. While \$25,000 was allocated for a consultant to develop a water conservation plan, and this dollar amount is not insignificant, it is adequate only for providing the City an outline of proposed action for conservation with general rather than specific recommendations for implementation. The coalition supported this expenditure of public funds as a means to move the City forward on this issue. It appears the City prefers advice from outside consultants rather than adopting measures recommended by its own advisory commissions (this is further explored in Section 2).

The coalition filed a petition to IDWR on November 21, 2003, due to a history of inaction regarding water resource planning in the Palouse Basin. This action took place as a result of the City's failure to work toward conserving water, as requested by the coalition for the 2003 watering season, and failure to schedule a previously agreed-to quarterly meeting with coalition members. The coalition made attempts to work with the City to little or no effect. Water pumpage in Moscow will likely reach an all-time high in 2003.

The City of Moscow has failed to comply with the 1992 Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) for seven years. While some assumptions in the 1992 GMP have been disproven, no other document supercedes it. Additional goals were adopted by PBAC in 2000, but many of those goals have not been implemented as per the timetable listed. Moscow's Comprehensive Plan states, "These political entities [Moscow, Pullman, Latah County, and Whitman County] should unite in an effort to reverse this historical trend of aquifer depletion to prevent a water shortage from occurring (2-8)." That trend has not been reversed.

Many members of the various coalition groups have lived in this area for 10 to 20 years and longer. They anticipate spending the remainder of their lives here and hope to provide a sustainable quality of life for their children, grandchildren and others.

As the Time Line indicates, there has been minimal cooperation with Coalition members over the past eight months. More aggressive outdoor watering regulations could have been implemented for the summer 2003 watering season without detriment to area residents and businesses; however, another opportunity for real education and water savings has come and gone with only an additional increase in water usage to show for it. Numerous suggestions for water-use reduction made to City leaders over the past four years have gone unheeded as will be evidenced in later sections of this report.

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. A copy of the petition itself
2. Time Line

Section 2: City of Moscow

Summary:

The City of Moscow has exceeded pumpage goals as set forth in the 1992 Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) for seven years. The City is aware we have a dwindling water supply. While some assumptions in the 1992 GMP have been disproven, no other document has superseded it.

Comprehensive Plan

The Moscow Comprehensive Plan (1999) states, "Concerns over water level declines have motivated hydro-geologic studies of local aquifer system issues. Knowledge about our water supply has increased, and continues to increase, but significant uncertainty remains. While it appears that existing water supplies are sufficient for current needs, there remains uncertainty about the extent of additional pumping capacity (2-3 and 2-4)." Also, "These political entities [Moscow, Pullman, Latah County, and Whitman County] should unite in an effort to reverse this historical trend of aquifer depletion to prevent a water shortage from occurring (2-8)." That trend has not been reversed.

Projected Growth

Concerned citizens worry that Moscow will be forced into a crisis situation with an expanding population placing increased demand on a declining groundwater supply. Such a crisis could be avoided with careful planning. Unfortunately, local government has not made water resource planning a high priority.

Moscow has had a very steady average growth rate of 1.5% per year over the last decade. At the current growth rate of 1.5% and current per capita per day consumption, Moscow will double its consumption of water by the year 2049 and triple it by the year 2077. If you assume a 2% growth rate, consumption doubles by 2038; at 3% doubling occurs in 2026; at 4% doubling occurs in 2021; and at 5% doubling occurs in 2017—well ahead of the 2020 planning time frame to stabilize the Grande Ronde Aquifer utilized by PBAC.

Pumping Data

The following chart prepared by Moscow Public Works Director Mark Cook shows pumping schedules for 1994-2002. Moscow exceeds 1992 GMP goals by the following amounts for each year:

Moscow annual pumpage in millions of gallons

Year	Amount pumped	One percent target	Amount over	125% cap
1994	848	755	93	875
1995	791	762	29	875
1996	858	770	117	875
1997	826	778	48	875
1998	846	785	61	875
1999	889	793	96	875
2000	912	800	112	875
2001	893	807	86	875
2002	874	814	60	875
Total			702	

- Mark Cook indicates that his data was obtained from PBAC reports. It has come to the attention of the coalition that there are different data sets in use. The PBAC figures were adjusted in 1999 due to well meter calibrations (see PBAC 1999 Annual Report, Appendix B). While it is appropriate to use PBAC figures in this chart to compare to PBAC target pumping goals, different (higher) pumping figures for years 1986-1998 are currently being used by the City of Moscow to show a decrease in pumping from the Grande Ronde over time. If the figures currently being used by the City were plugged into this chart, then the overages would be even greater.

While Moscow has increased the percentage of Wanapum water pumped from about 0 in 1990 to 30-34% today, the enclosed pumping figures show the overall increases in the amount of water used in Moscow annually. Pumping from the Wanapum reduces demand on the Grande Ronde, but has other concerns including extra filtering of the Wanapum water to reduce iron and manganese in the water.

Pumping numbers reported in the PBAC Annual Reports vary from the numbers used in recent City reports showing reductions in pumping from the Grande Ronde aquifer.

Moscow's Commission on Health and the Environment

This advisory commission to the Moscow City Council has made several attempts to take research and recommendations from PBAC and bring them forward to the City Council for implementation as will be evidenced in Section 3.

Per Capita per Day Consumption Must be Reduced

The local area must reduce its per capita per day consumption of water through various conservation means while also beginning fund raising for education, programs, and specific alternate sources of water for future use. Ultimately this is a local/regional problem that requires local/regional funding. Federal and State funding should also be obtained where possible for additional research and programs, but these sources of funds are uncertain and irregular.

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. Selected Excerpts from the 1999 Moscow Comprehensive Plan including growth estimates
2. Idaho Growth Projections
3. Latah County Growth Projections
4. Pumping Figures from the City of Moscow (1996 – 2003)
5. City of Moscow Water Department Memo from October 1999
6. Memo from Mark Cook to Gary Riedner with Moscow Annual Pumpage Table
7. Letter regarding discovery of multiple data sets by Bill French

Section 3: Proposed Action Not Taken

Summary:

Numerous detailed proposals have been presented to the City from its own Commission on Health and the Environment (H&E) as well as citizens; however, few of the necessary measures have been implemented. The City has not shifted public policy to address the desires of the community as evidenced by response in citizen surveys (see Section 7, "Surveys"). While repeatedly claiming lack of funding as an excuse for inaction, the City has not moved toward more progressive rate structures to plan and budget for the cost of the inevitable solutions to our water problem.

Though the City itself has reduced water usage by reducing hydrant flushing, increasing leak detection programs, and pursuing reductions in unaccounted-for water, these actions are clearly not enough. Water

conservation devices are made available to those citizens who request them and a conservation plan is in the works, but no measures to address water consumption or conservation in new developments are currently enforced.

Some members of the coalition have attempted to work through City channels over the past four years via the Commission on Health and the Environment (H&E), an advisory commission to the Moscow City Council. After having served on H&E for four years in the early 1990's, Dianne French perceived that H&E was a natural avenue for assisting PBAC in achieving its conservation, rate re-structuring and public policy goals and was re-appointed to the commission. PBAC is a technical advisory group and, as such, has no regulatory authority. By bridging the gap between PBAC and City government, H&E could assist in implementation of PBAC recommendations. However, lack of City response to H&E suggestions and proposals based on PBAC research and goals, has escalated frustrations.

It is believed that the community could achieve 20 to 25% water savings through a comprehensive conservation program. Many years and much water have been wasted by not already implementing such a program. Introduction of water efficiency measures will not adversely impact the local economy, is likely to be embraced by local citizens, and is the least expensive source of alternative water.

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. H&E Meeting Minutes, September 1993
2. Working Draft: PBAC to H&E—How a City Can Reduce Demand for Water, June 2000
3. H&E Water Conservation Plan, November 2000
4. "Proposed Water Conservation Timeline," Bill French, November 2000
5. "Presentation to Public Works/Finance Committee" (H&E Report following AWWA 2001 Water Conservation Workshop), February 2001
6. City of Moscow Public Works/Finance Committee Agenda packet, February 26, 2001
7. Water Resource Issues Past, Current, and Pending, Mark Cook to H&E, August 2001
8. Memo from Public Works Director Mark Cook to City Supervisor, June 11, 2003
9. H&E Draft Conservation Plan, June 2003

Section 4: Research

Summary:

Geologists, hydrologists, soil scientists and others have conducted over 130 studies on the Palouse Basin. This body of research, though informative on many counts, still leaves us guessing how much water is available in our aquifers. Over the past several years, questions regarding "how long" our Grande Ronde aquifer will last have been answered at anywhere between 25 and 900 years depending on who is answering. Much lip service has been paid to solving our problem, but we have yet to adopt a long-term plan for doing so.

Belknap's "Summary of Research Completed on the Moscow-Pullman Basin" reviews 43 studies that were completed by 1999. Additional research indicates geologic folds that may impede water movement from east to west (Moscow to Pullman) and that wells in Palouse, Washington are affected by pumping tests in both Moscow and Pullman—more so than Moscow and Pullman affect each other.

Most other research on the geology and hydrogeology of the Palouse Basin is on file with PBAC, or via Drs. Jim Osiensky and John Bush at the University of Idaho or Dr. Kent Keller at Washington State University.

Included in this section is other research on a more grassroots level about water use and misuse within the community itself.

Another area of concern is unaccounted-for water—water that was pumped according to pumping records, but never shows up as being billed for or accounted-for on water bills. In June-July 2002, unaccounted-for water

ranged as high as 35-40%. This trend shows up again in summer of 2003. Average unaccounted-for water was listed as 22.1% in November, 2003, and a verbal report from Tom Scallorn, Water Department Supervisor, in December 2003 indicated that the "real" amount is likely about 8%. More research must be done on this issue to determine conclusively where our precious water is going.

The more we know, the less we think we know about the physical properties of our aquifer system, but there is not an appreciable downside to efficient water use, solid conservation, and comprehensive planning for future alternative options and their funding.

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. Geology and Hydrogeology of the Petition Area, Sarah Koerber
2. "Summary of Research Completed on the Moscow-Pullman Basin Hydrology", Bill Belknap, March 1999
3. Abstract: "Water Resource Implications...In a Basalt Aquifer System," Larson, et. al., Nov-Dec 2000
4. "Water Efficiency on the Palouse" Helena Gregory, Spring 2000
5. "Water Usage In Moscow City Parks," Bill French, 1994-1999
6. Letter to City Council on Wasted Water at Fairgrounds, Bill French, September 2000
7. 2001 Report to Council on Comparison Water use for a conserving household and a non-conserving household, Bill French
8. Accounted-for Vs. Unaccounted-for Water

Section 5: Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee

Summary:

According to the 1999 Annual Report of The Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee, "The possibility of regulatory intervention coupled with local concern over a water supply shortage resulted in the official reactivation of the PMWRC in October of 1987," which "changed its name to the Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee (PBAC) in acknowledgement of the regional extent of the aquifers and the thousands of rural residents in unincorporated areas of the counties that also depend on the aquifers for water." The "Ground Water Management Plan" (PLAN) of the PMWRC (September, 1992) indicates "the COMMITTEE is charged to coordinate planning in order to ensure a long-term supply of water for the ENTITIES, encourage water conservation, maintain an area ground water data base, investigate the primary and alternative water sources, and act as a liaison between the ENTITIES and the governing state agencies." Furthermore, the PLAN states:

The COMMITTEE will provide guidance related to water-use plans, conservation strategies relative to water use, implementation policies, and the preparation of local ordinances or zoning regulations.

Public involvement and education in BASIN water management issues are extremely important. The success of public education and the level of participation in conservation and other water resource issues will be assessed annually. It will be incumbent upon the members of the COMMITTEE to keep abreast of effective water resource management practices and articulate these concepts to the ENTITIES and their constituents.

However, "Responsibility of implementation of the PLAN rests with the ENTITIES."

According to the 2001 Annual Report of the Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee, "PBAC reviewed and updated its original goals from the Ground water Management Plan to include:

1. Stabilize the ground water levels in the Grande Ronde aquifer by 2020.
2. Implement efficient water use and water conservation practices to reduce pumping from the deep Grande Ronde aquifer.

3. Continue to promote a program of public outreach and education for efficient water use and awareness of ground water issues in the Palouse Basin.
4. Continue data collection and analysis of ground water levels and usage for the basin.
5. Continue to support research in the Palouse Basin.
6. Protect the high quality of ground water in the Palouse Basin.
7. Utilize PBAC funds to match outside funding wherever possible for maximum benefit."

The document (adopted 6/15/00) that updated the original goals also mandated completing these tasks prior to 2002:

- Enumerate all possible options to stabilize GRAS water levels
- Complete study on the real value of water pumped from the GRAS
- Commission a study to examine cost of all supplemental sources
- Add use and comparison data to the water bills each month (Moscow and Pullman)

By the end of 2003, this document also expected Moscow and Pullman to:

- Calculate sewage bills based on the amount of water used
- Increase the number of tiers in the water billing system

As of December 29, 2003, none of these goals have been realized, aside from data collection and research support. Funded research strongly suggests that the Palouse Groundwater Basin is receiving little or no recharge, with water samples from municipal wells dating to 12,000-24,000 years old and water levels steadily dropping 1-2 feet per year. Meanwhile, conservation, public education and public involvement continue to be ignored. The 1992 PLAN stipulated that:

At the end of each five-year cycle a detailed PLAN review will be made and the PLAN will be modified as necessary to reflect the changing needs of the ENTITIES and the PLAN. The goals, recommended strategies, and research priorities will be evaluated in regard to changing physical, economic, social, and political conditions of the Pullman-Moscow area. These revisions will be implemented based upon updated BASIN information, the success of particular management strategies, and input from public hearings. The adoption and implementation of any changes to the PLAN will be done with the full review of the ENTITIES and the two state agencies.

The public has had no opportunity for input to any revisions to the PLAN and no public hearings have been held since March 25, 1992. In a recent (2/20/03) PBAC meeting, a suggestion by Latah County representative Tom Townsend to "hold an evening meeting that would presumably allow more interested individuals to attend" was unanimously ridiculed by PBAC members, whose priority seems to be holding meetings when they will get paid for attending. PBAC chairman, Mark Workman, said "The public is adequately represented by their community's representatives to this committee".

The 2001 Annual Report claims, "PBAC also serves as a resource to all six entities and the community at-large for water conservation issues." But PBAC's web site (*which has not been updated since March 2002*) only contains a link to AWWA's conservation tips, and PBAC members are generally ignorant of the practice or potential of conservation measures. Supposedly, "PBAC continued to encourage water conservation to the entities and citizens that rely on ground water from the basin for all their water supply needs." But Moscow representative and City Council member Steve Busch has repeatedly said that he "Won't support draconian conservation measures by the citizens of Moscow so people in Pullman can wash their cars more often." Busch also likes to say that "conservation alone won't solve the problem", apparently ignoring the fact that conservation is an important component of any plan for sustainable water use.

The 1992 PLAN states this goal:

TO PROMOTE A PROGRAM OF PUBLIC EDUCATION AND AWARENESS REGARDING BASIN GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT ISSUES.

The COMMITTEE shall pursue and develop a program of public education to encourage conservation and reuse of water. Programs soliciting public support for committee activities and efforts to stabilize the water level will be developed.

But this public education and awareness hasn't been pursued and most users remain ignorant of the source and limitations of their jointly-held water supply.

In summary, while PBAC has been fairly effective in data collection and research coordination, it has failed in the areas of public involvement, education, conservation, and funding. With the voting members of PBAC being representatives of local governments, PBAC will never have the political will to regulate those governments. Once a groundwater management advisory committee has been formed, PBAC should continue with data collection and research. But development of a groundwater management plan, including the authority to devise and enforce implementation strategies, should be the responsibility of the GMAC.

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. PBAC Web page—web site not updated since March 2002
2. PBAC Selected Minutes September 1999 through October 2003
3. PBAC Aquifer Storage and Recovery Information

Section 6: Rate Structure Proposals

Summary:

Even a simple measure that would not have required any rate study was not implemented. Had Moscow simply raised its base water rate by \$5 per customer per month beginning in 1993, \$2,820,000 could have been raised in the intervening 10-year period and used toward conservation and funding future solutions. This calculation assumes an average of 4700 customer accounts.

Conservation rates can be defined as "rates that encourage efficient use of water resources" according to George A. Raftelis, president of Raftelis Financial Consulting, PA in Charlotte, NC, and author of 2000 Water and Wastewater Rate Survey and Comprehensive Guide to Water and Wastewater Finance and Pricing. Conservation rate structures, if properly designed and implemented by a utility, can promote efficient water use and allow the utility to meet essential revenue requirements. Additionally, by encouraging wise use through rates, customers can make their own decisions about which water uses have the highest value to them. By allowing the customer to self-regulate, the municipality does not incur the costs associated with regulating behavior through development and enforcement of ordinances derived to control how all community members utilize this resource.

Item number 4 below, written by Bill and Dianne French, was submitted to H&E for discussion. H&E members' discussions were tabled when Public Works Director Mark Cook said "Not in an election year. City staff won't support this in an election year and without staff support, you won't get council support." The above proposals have all been submitted to the City both in writing and during public meetings, but most of the components have not been implemented.

PBAC bemoans not receiving \$100,000 from the Idaho State Legislature in 2001 (and possibly another \$100,000 in 2002) for research on aquifer interconnection. However, had the entities adjusted rates, and earmarked funds for just such projects, twenty times that amount could have been raised from Moscow alone.

While Federal and State funds have the advantage of being "outside" money available to assist in problem solving, the challenge of receiving such funding should lead community leaders to work toward local funding where possible and consider "outside" money an additional bonus toward solving local/regional issues. The City of Moscow has received several proposals for reasonable local funding mechanisms that could have

resulted in real steps toward solving the problem without undue burden on area residents especially those already faced with difficult financial situations.

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. "Moscow Water Issues," John Wenders, University of Idaho Economist, June 2001
2. "A Combination of Several Alternatives May Contribute to Reaching Goal," Juliet McKenna, PBAC Executive Secretary/Technical Advisor
3. Idaho Dept of Environmental Quality Water Fee Information from web site
4. Draft Proposal for Reducing Peak Water Usage in Moscow., Dianne (and Bill) French, March 2003

Section 7: Surveys

Summary:

Surveys over the years indicate Moscow residents are aware we have a water problem, that our aquifers are declining and want the city to implement conservation measures. It is hard to understand the City's absence of leadership toward water conservation and movement toward a long-term plan for providing water for our growing community.

- A 1969 survey indicates citizen support for water resource conservation
- A 1986 survey shows 72% of respondents considered need for water conservation in Moscow to be very or somewhat serious and 65% thought City should implement water conservation measures "now or in the near future"
- A 2002 survey by the City itself showed 87% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that City should take additional steps to protect and conserve our water supply
- In 2003, a survey by the Moscow Water Department indicated 81% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that there is cause for concern regarding the amount of water in our aquifer. 70% agree or strongly agree that they can reduce water use without detriment to quality of life. 85% feel long term, healthy growth in Moscow depends on conservation of and efficient use of water. Each of the seven potential conservation measures listed received at least a 65% approval rating.

Area residents have demonstrated their willingness to participate in solutions to our water problem, but have not received adequate leadership, education, or information from their community leaders.

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. "The Conservation of Water in Moscow, Idaho: A Survey of Public Opinion," Dr. Gary Machlis, 1986
2. 2002 Moscow Citizen Survey, City of Moscow
3. Survey of Moscow Water Users, June 2003, City of Moscow

Section 8: Public Testimony

Summary:

Citizens concerned about our diminishing water supply have submitted informative testimony at public hearings. In the City Council meeting on December 22, 2003, a four-year council member was heard to say, "It would be great to get some ideas about what we should do." As can be seen from this document, a

number of ideas, proposals and suggestions have been brought forward by various members of the community only to have, apparently, fallen on deaf ears.

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. "Water Supply on the Palouse," PBAC Executive Secretary/Technical Advisor Juliet McKenna, January 2001 Presentation to the Quarterly Leadership Breakfast (including City Councils and County Commissioners and Staff from Moscow, Pullman, Latah County and Whitman County)
2. Presentation to Public Works/Finance Committee of Moscow City Council by Dianne French, Moscow Commission on Health and the Environment, February 26, 2001
3. Selected Public Works/Finance Committee minutes
4. Dianne French Testimony to Moscow Planning and Zoning Commission regarding new annexation/development, November 12, 2003
5. Dianne French Testimony to Moscow City Council, December 15, 2003

Section 9: Correspondence

Summary:

Conservationists, PBAC members, economists, and public officials have been engaged in a discussion on what to do about water resource planning for many years.

Documents Contained in this Section:

Numerous letters and emails in chronological order

Section 10: "Potable Quotables" and Newspaper Articles

Summary:

Years of discussion, research, and inaction have been documented in the local press. Potable Quotables contains selected quotes from public officials (and others involved in this issue) over the past 14 years and largely demonstrates that little has changed in the intervening years.

Often talked about, the next step of influencing public policy has been ignored over the past 12 years. The 1992 Groundwater Management Plan cannot by itself save a drop of water. Volumes of research have been conducted, but the real measures that are needed still await implementation. These measures include community-wide conservation within Moscow and Pullman, a choice for the second alternative source of water (after conservation) for the area, and the raising of funds for what is likely to be a very expensive venture.

Documents Contained in this Section:

1. "Potable Quotables"
2. Copies of various newspaper articles related to this issue over the years.

Appendix A:

1992 Groundwater Management Plan (GMP)
2000 PBAC Goals

These are included for reference; many of the 2000 Goals have not been implemented.

Appendix B:

1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 PBAC Annual Reports
The Naylor Protocol

No 2002 Annual Report has been produced even though the Annual Reports are one of the most important tasks for PBAC.

Appendix C:

Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) Information

As stated by PBAC Researcher, Dr. Dale Ralston at the Palouse Water Supply Workshop on September 11, 2000, "Increasing recharge to the Grande Ronde will necessarily decrease water quality and we need to be prepared to face that fact."

The Coalition believes PBAC should not be running headlong into ASR in the Grande Ronde aquifer when Grande Ronde water is 10,000 to 24,000 years old and is of very high quality. It should not be needlessly put at risk when there may be other options for an alternate source or storage system. Risking polluting this pristine source of water is shortsighted. Additionally, mixing of water from different sources could potentially cause long-term plugging of the connector wells or plugging of the aquifer basalts near the wells.

If this is to be our main source of additional water after conservation, there is much information to consider. The possibility of utilizing the Wanapum for ASR appears more reasonable, both from water quality and cost standpoints, but public discussions about such measures need to happen early in the process so that there is broad community understanding and acceptance of ASR.